arXiv:1302.5572v2 [physics.atom-ph] 27 Feb 2013

Accurate Hylleraas-CI analysis of the low-lying states in the three-electron Li atom and Be$^+$ ion

Johannes T. Margraf* and María Belén Ruiz†
Department of Theoretical Chemistry
Friederich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nürnberg,
Egerlandstraße 3, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

Alexei M. Frolov‡
Department of Chemistry
University of Western Ontario,
London, Ontario N6H 5B7, Canada

(Dated: February 28, 2013)

Abstract

The energies of 21 and 22 bound states of S-, P-, D-, and F-symmetry of the three-electron systems Li atom and Be$^+$ ion, respectively, are calculated using the same quantum mechanical methods for all states, namely, the Configuration Interaction (CI) with Slater orbitals and L-S eigenfunctions, and the Hylleraas Configuration-Interaction (Hy-CI) methods. In this paper we discuss the construction and selection of the configurations in the wave functions, optimization of the orbital exponents and further computational techniques in order to calculate accurately the energy of the states using compact wave functions. The obtained accuracy for the energy using the Hy-CI method is about 1×10^{-6} a.u. in the case of low lying states and 1×10^{-4} a.u. for high excited states, with respect the nonrelativistic values. In the case of the CI method we obtain an overall of 1×10^{-3} a.u. accuracy. We present also a few benchmark calculations and new values for very high excited states.

---

*E–mail address: johannes.margraf@chemie.uni-erlangen.de
†E–mail address: Maria.Belen.Ruiz@chemie.uni-erlangen.de
‡E–mail address: afrolov@uwo.ca

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays Li atom has become, like the He atom years before, a system to test Quantum Chemistry and High Precision Atomic Physics [1–3]. The non-relativistic wave functions of three-electron atoms and ions are of great interest in applications related to highly accurate evaluations of the lowest-order relativistic and QED corrections. At this moment we do not have any closed procedure which can be used to construct Dirac-type (or manifestly covariant) wave functions for two- and three-electron systems. Therefore, in actual applications such few-electron wave functions are approximated by the solutions of the non-relativistic Schödinger equation(s). All corrections are evaluated with the use of the regular Rayleigh-Schödinger perturbation theory. It explains why the non-relativistic wave functions of three-electrons atoms and ions are of paramount importance in applications. On the other hand, the accuracy of modern laser-based atomic experiments allows one to determine many transition lines (or transition energies) in three-electron atoms and ions to the accuracy which could be expected even twenty years ago. To match these experimental results we need to increase (and very substantially) the accuracy of our current non-relativistic three-electron wave functions.

In the last few years the low lying states of the Li atom have been calculated to the accuracy from a nanohartree to beyond a picohartree ($1 \times 10^{-9} - 10^{-12}$ a.u.) [4–7]. These calculations which serve to test the Quantum Mechanical methods, are performed once, and their requested computational times or the length of the wave function expansions are of no importance. They are benchmark calculations. Usually the corresponding wave functions are extremely long, in the order of several ten thousands of configurations. This fact makes it impossible to employ these wave functions in production calculations or the calculation of properties, and this despite of the development of the computer technology. Therefore there is a need of accurate methods with accuracies in the order of a cm^{-1} (spectroscopical accuracy). For this reason, the research on compact wave functions is still in continuous development [8–12].

For the calculation of properties it would be desirable to have at hand all energies and matrix elements for ground and all excited states, and in addition, these states should be calculated with approximately the same accuracy. Moreover numerous excited states of all symmetry types (S, P, D, F, . . .) are usually needed, i.e. for the calculation of the probability of ionization. Not less importantly, the computational time should be acceptable. Here the example of the Li atom can serve to test the methods and techniques which are developed for the calculations of properties, like excitation energies, transition probabilities, ionization energies, analysis of optical spectra, energy levels in confinement conditions, nuclear reactions and $\beta^{\pm}$-decays, etc, see, e.g., Ref. [13]

In this work we employ the Hylleraas-Configuration Interaction method (Hy-CI) and the Configuration Interaction (CI) method with Slater orbitals and L-S eigenfunctions to calculate all states of the Li atom and Be^+ ion which lay below their respective energy limits of electronic ionization. In the next sections we will discuss the technique to select the energetically important configurations, and the optimization procedure of the orbital exponents in order to calculate accurately compact wave function expansions. Using this method we have obtained several benchmark energies.

II. THE HY-CI AND CI METHODS

The Hy-CI method was proposed by Sims and Hagstrom [14–16]. The advantage of the Hy-CI method with respect to the other Hylleraas-type methods is that only up to one interelectronic coordinate r_{ij} per configuration is introduced into the wave function and therefore, the method can in principle be applied to any atom. Calculations using Hy-CI wave functions on the atoms from He to B and the H_2 molecule are reported in Refs. [4, 17–22]. The CI wave function with Slater orbitals and L-S eigenfunctions can be considered as a basic part of the Hy-CI wave function. Therefore in this work we start our calculations with the CI wave functions. In this respect, we follow the same method as Weiss and Bunge [23, 24] and use relatively small basis sets. Recent extensive CI calculations with Slater orbitals on Be and B atoms which are more accurate can be found in Refs. [25, 26]. Both Hy-CI and CI wave functions can be summarized in the following expression:

$$\Psi = \sum_{p=1}^{N} C_p \Phi_p, \qquad \Phi_p = \hat{O}(\hat{L}^2)\hat{\mathcal{A}}\phi_p\chi \tag{1}$$

The Hy-CI and CI wave functions are linear combinations of N symmetry adapted configurations Φ_p and the coefficients C_p are determined variationally. In this work the symmetry adapted configurations are constructed 'a priori' so that they are eigenfunctions of the angular momentum operator $\hat{L}^2$. Another possibility would be the posterior projection of the configurations over the proper spatial space, as signalized in Eq. (1) by the projection operator $\hat{O}(\hat{L}^2)$. $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is teh antisymmetrization operator, and the spin eigenfunction χ. In the case of the Li atom it is sufficient to use only one spin-function (formally a linear combination of the two possible spin eigenfunctions would be necessary):

$$\chi = [(\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha)\alpha] \tag{2}$$

since the energetic contribution of the second spin eigenfunction has been proven to be small (in the order of 1×10^{-9} a.u. [7, 27]). Moreover the Slater determinants produced by the second spin eigenfunction $(2\alpha\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)$ (due to the antisymmetry) are repeated when considering already the first spin eigenfunction $(\alpha\beta\alpha - \beta\alpha\alpha)$. The spatial part of the basis functions are Hartree products of Slater orbitals:

$$\phi_p = r_{ij}^{\nu} \prod_{k=1}^{n} \phi_k(r_k, \theta_k, \varphi_k). \tag{3}$$

The powers $\nu = 0, 1$ stay for CI and Hy-CI wave functions, respectively. Powers $\nu > 1$ are effectively reduced to $\nu = 0, 1$ since all even and odd powers of r_{ij} can be expressed as a product of r_{ij} times a polynomial in r_i, r_j and angular functions.

The basis functions ϕ_p, are products of *s*-, *p*-, *d*- and *f*-Slater orbitals. Higher angular orbitals are in practice not needed. They are needed to obtain an accuracy of about a nanohartree (1×10^{-9} a.u.) or higher (see Ref. [4]). We use unnormalized complex Slater orbitals for which the exponents are adjustable parameters, defined as:

$$\phi(\mathbf{r}) = r^{n-1} e^{-\alpha r} Y_l^m(\theta, \varphi). \tag{4}$$

The spherical harmonics with Condon and Shortley phase [28, p. 52] are given by:

$$Y_l^m(\theta, \varphi) = (-1)^m \left[\frac{2l+1}{4\pi} \frac{(l-m)!}{(l+m)!} \right]^{1/2} P_l^m(\cos\theta) e^{im\varphi}, \tag{5}$$

where $P_l^m(\cos\theta)$ are the associated Legendre functions. The spherical harmonics and associated Legendre functions used along this work are written explicitly in [29, p. 14].

The Hamiltonian in Hylleraas coordinates may be written [30, 31]

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_i^2} - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{Z}{r_i} - \sum_{i<j}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_{ij}^2} - \sum_{i<j}^{n}\frac{2}{r_{ij}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r_{ij}} + \sum_{i<j}^{n}\frac{1}{r_{ij}}$$
$$- \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\neq j}^{n}\frac{r_i^2 + r_{ij}^2 - r_j^2}{r_i r_{ij}}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_i \partial r_{ij}} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\neq j}^{n}\sum_{k>j}^{n}\frac{r_{ij}^2 + r_{ik}^2 - r_{jk}^2}{r_{ij} r_{ik}}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_{ij}\partial r_{ik}}$$
$$- \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_i^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_i^2\sin^2\theta_i}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varphi_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\cot\theta_i}{r_i^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}$$
$$- \sum_{i\neq j}^{n}\left(\frac{r_j}{r_i r_{ij}}\frac{\cos\theta_j}{\sin\theta_i} + \frac{1}{2}\cot\theta_i\frac{r_{ij}^2 - r_i^2 - r_j^2}{r_i^2 r_{ij}}\right)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i\partial r_{ij}}$$
$$- \sum_{i\neq j}^{n}\frac{r_j}{r_i r_{ij}}\frac{\sin\theta_j}{\sin\theta_i}\sin\left(\varphi_i - \varphi_j\right)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\varphi_i\partial r_{ij}} \ . \quad (6)$$

The angular momentum operator can be extracted from Eq. (6):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_i^2}\hat{L}_i^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_i^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{r_i^2\sin^2\theta_i}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\varphi_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\cot\theta_i}{r_i^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}, \quad (7)$$

and its eigenvalue equation used:

$$L_i^2\phi_i = l_i(l_i+1)\phi_i, \quad (8)$$

with l_i the angular quantum number of the orbital ϕ_i. In the case of Hy-CI wave functions the term $\partial^2/(\partial r_{ij}\partial r_{ik})$ containing derivatives with respect to two r_{ij} vanishes.

The kinetic energy operator has been separated into several radial and angular parts. This operator has the advantage that for the case of three-electron kinetic integrals the expansion of r_{ij} into $r_<$ and $r_>$ is avoided, and therefore no three-electron auxiliary integrals W integrals are needed, see Ref. [32]. This fact saves not only calculations but also memory space. Only the easily computed two-electron auxiliary integrals $V(n,m;\alpha,\beta)$ are needed.

From the variational principle one obtains the matrix eigenvalue problem:

$$(\mathbf{H} - E\mathbf{S})\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (9)$$

where the matrix elements are:

$$H_{kl} = \int \Phi_k H \Phi_l d\tau, \qquad S_{kl} = \int \Phi_k \Phi_l d\tau. \quad (10)$$

The occurring integrals in Hy-CI calculations of three-electron systems are two-, and three-electron integrals. The two-electron integrals are of the types:

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle r_{12}\rangle, \qquad \langle r_{12}^2\rangle, \qquad \left\langle \frac{1}{r_{12}} \right\rangle, \\ &\langle r_{12}\rangle\langle r_{34}\rangle, \qquad \langle r_{12}\rangle\left\langle \frac{1}{r_{34}} \right\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The notation $\langle r_{12}\rangle$ represents the integral where the left and right hand side orbitals of electrons $1, 2$ are involved $\langle \phi(\mathbf{r}_1)\phi(\mathbf{r}_2) r_{12} \phi(\mathbf{r}_1)\phi(\mathbf{r}_2)\rangle$. In this work the two-electron integrals have been calculated with the algorithms described in Ref. [33]. The three-electron integrals are of the following types:

$$\left\langle r_{12}r_{13} \right\rangle, \qquad \left\langle r_{12}^2 r_{13} \right\rangle, \qquad \left\langle \frac{r_{12}}{r_{13}} \right\rangle, \qquad \left\langle \frac{r_{12}r_{13}}{r_{23}} \right\rangle \tag{12}$$

the first three cases are evaluated by direct integration over both, one r_{ij} and one electron, and thus reduced to a linear combination of two-electron integrals [34]. Only the so-called triangle integral $\langle r_{12}r_{13}/r_{23}\rangle$ has not been developed by us and we use a very efficient subroutine from Sims and Hagstrom [35]. Finally the two- and three-electron kinetic energy integrals have been evaluated using the Hamiltonian of Eq. (6) [32, 33].

The method of integration consists in the direct integration over the interelectronic coordinates r_{ij} and simultaneously over the coordinates of one electron. The integration of a three-electron integral leads then to a limited linear combination of two-electron integrals. These should be calculated very accurately in terms of two-electron auxiliary integrals $V(m, n; \alpha, \beta)$, defined:

$$V(m, n; \alpha, \beta) = \int_0^\infty r_1^m e^{-\alpha r_1} dr_1 \int_{r_1}^\infty r_2^n e^{-\beta r_2} dr_2 \ , \tag{13}$$

The two-electron auxiliary integrals with positive indices m, n are evaluated efficiently in our computer program in terms of one-electron auxiliary integrals $A(n, \alpha)$ [36]. Altogether only two-electron integrals, as in the case of the CI method, and triangle integrals have to be computed. This fact will be extremely helpful when extending the application of Hy-CI method to larger systems. In our code, approximately the same computer memory is needed for CI and Hy-CI calculations. Note, that in the Hy-CI method for any electron number (starting with four electrons systems) no higher order integrals than four-electron ones will occur.

For our calculations in this study we have written a three-electron Hy-CI computer program for three-electron systems in Fortran 90. The calculations have been done with the use of the quadruple precision. The program has been thoroughly checked comparing results of our numerical calculations with analogous results by Sims and Hagstrom [4] and King [9] for the lithium atom. Note that in such calculations we have obtained complete agreement.

III. CALCULATIONS

A. Construction and selection of the symmetry adapted configurations

In this work we have performed a systematical selection of the CI and Hy-CI configurations according to their energy contribution. The ground state configuration of the Li atom and Be^+ ion is sss (i.e. $s(1)s(2)s(3)$) and the configurations for the S-symmetry states (L=0) that have been selected in energetic order are *spp*, *pps*, *sdd*, *dds*, sff and ffs. The energetically important configurations for $L = 1, 2, 3$ are listed in Table I. The quantum number M=0 has been chosen because usually for this case an smaller number of Slater determinants is required. More types of configurations can be constructed for L=0. For instance, configurations like *psp* if the exponents $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$ could be considered. In this work the orbital exponents in the K-shell are kept equal, see Tables III and IV, therefore configurations like *psp* are equivalent to the configurations *spp*.

Other possible configurations with L=0, M=0 like *ppp* do exist but were discarded after being tested in actual calculations, when their overall energy contribution was less than 1×10^{-8} a.u. Table II shows how the configurations used in this work have been constructed with *s*-, *p*-, *d*- and *f*-Slater orbitals. In addition, there are more possible 'degenerated L-eigenfunctions' solutions with a larger number of Slater determinants (they are degenerated with respect to the quantum numbers L and M but with possible different energy contribution, i.e. non-degenerate with respect to the energy) [24]. Although the inclusion of various degenerated configurations has been proved to improve the energy of the state, this contribution is very small. This is important for very accurate CI calculations, like the ones of Bunge [25, 26]. In our work, we have concentrated in the energetically most important

CI configurations in order to use them as a basis for Hy-CI configurations (configurations multiplied by an interelectronic distance r_{ij}).

After selecting the types of configurations, we have constructed complete blocks of these configurations for a given basis set. For instance for the basis n=4 (i.e. [4s3p2d1f] or [1s,2s,3s,4s,2p,3p,3d,4f]) in the *sss* block we have considered the configurations: $1s1s2s$, $1s2s2s$, $2s2s2s$, $1s1s3s$, $1s2s3s$, $2s2s3s$, $\ldots$, $4s4s4s$. Note that the configuration $1s1s1s$ has no physical meaning but posses a large energy contribution. Altogether our CI calculations can be considered 'selected' with respect to the type of configuration, and 'full-CI' with respect to the orbitals basis set.

Another important aspect in CI and Hy-CI calculations is the symmetry adaptation of the configurations. The configurations are constructed 'a priori' so that they are eigenfunctions of the angular momentum operator $\hat{L}^2$. In the sums of Table II the configurations are formed by Slater determinants. The determinants are pairwise symmetric (i.e. sp_1p_{-1} and $sp_{-1}p_1$ in the *spp* configuration) and lead to the same values of the electronic integrals. Therefore it is possible and desirable to consider only one of the determinants and to figure out the result by the other. Concretely, the solutions of the eigenvalue problem, using reduced matrix elements 1×1 (where the integrals are added, configuration $sp_1p_{-1} + sp_{-1}p_1$) or explicit matrix elements 2×2 of the Slater determinants, are the same. The symmetry adaptation is computationally favorable, since the number of Slater determinants in the input is smaller and repeated computation of equal integrals is avoided. By observation of table II, the procedure can be used for all constructed configurations.

The Hy-CI configuration blocks have been constructed by including (1) the corresponding CI block; (2) the CI block multiplied by the interelectronic coordinate r_{12}; (3) the CI block multiplied by r_{13}; and (4) the CI block multiplied by r_{23}. Here one has to take into account the existing symmetries between equivalent configurations. This fact can produce linear dependences which make that the calculation break down (linear dependent equations in the eigenvalue problem). For example, $2s2s3s \times r_{13}$ is equal/equivalent to $2s2s3s \times r_{23}$.

In general, energetically important Hy-CI configurations must not be the same than the corresponding CI ones, but usually this is the case. Therefore we have constructed the Hy-CI blocks of configurations from the selected CI ones. The number of configurations grows very fast when adding the three r_{ij} factors. Therefore we have filtered the configurations within a block one by one with the energy criterion $|E_{i-1} - E_i| > 10^{-7}$a.u. This means that all configurations have been checked and the ones whose energy contribution is small have been discarded. These configurations are kept and could be included in more accurate wave functions. Subsequently, configurations with higher n were added and filtered. The selection process has been carried out for every state. Therefore the calculated wave functions for the Li atom and Be$^+$ ion in ground and excited states include different configurations and have different lengths.

B. Optimization of the orbital exponents

The orbital exponents have been optimized for each atomic state of the Li atom and Be$^+$ ion. A set of two exponents has been used, one for the K-shell and the other for the odd-electron of the L-shell. It was kept equal for all configurations. This technique accelerates the computations obtaining sufficiently accurate results for the purposes of the calculation of properties. It is clear that for highly accurate energies beyond microhartree-accuracy, more flexibility in the exponents is needed, as shown in recent calculations on the lithium atom with extensive optimization [4, 9–11] or in calculations with very large wave functions with carefully chosen exponents [4, 6, 7, 37]. The virial factor:

$$\chi = -\frac{\langle V \rangle}{2\langle T \rangle} \tag{14}$$

is used to check the quality of the wave function and guide the numerical optimization of the exponents in the trial wave functions.

The optimization of two exponents at the same time, in the case of Li for all configurations, has the advantage that (being a global optimization) it is very fast, in contrast with the partial optimization of configurations one by one, which may take very long computational times.

The optimization of the orbital exponents has been carried out with the help of a parabolic procedure. The orbital exponents are varied in by a step size. Three energy values are calculated and fitted to a parabola. The minimum of the parabola is calculated. Subsequently, this value is kept fixed and the same is done for the next exponent. The procedure consists of cycles and macrocycles. In the macrocycles, the step size is decreased by a given factor and the cycles of exponents are repeated. At every step the virial factor is calculated. The optimization is repeated until the energy no longer improves, and the best virial and energy values agree. The optimization program is completely automatic and the exponents can be optimized for every state and nuclear charge.

In Tables III and IV the optimized exponents of the CI and Hy-CI wave functions are given. Note that the CI exponents are in general larger than the Hy-CI ones. This is in part because for the Hy-CI wave functions we are using smaller basis set. For low lying states we have optimized a set of about 400 Hy-CI functions. For higher states (≥ 4) we have taken the CI exponents for the Hy-CI wave functions.

IV. RESULTS

We have calculated the S-, P-, D-, and F-symmetry states of Li atom with the CI method using the symmetry adapted configurations of Table I, starting with a basis set $n = 4$. The orbital exponents were optimized until the same energy minimum was obtained in two successive optimizations. Then these exponents were used in the next CI calculation with the basis $n = 5$, and optimized again, and so on until the basis $n = 7$. The optimized exponents of the basis $n = 7$ are given in Table III. For the Be$^+$ ion the same procedure was repeated with the nuclear charge $Z = 4$. The excited states were determined by optimization of the orbital exponents for the second, third, ... eigenvalue. Note that in strictly variational methods, the successive excited states are the roots of the eigenvalue problem. We have obtained energies that are about 1 millihartree accurate (1×10^{-3} a.u.) with respect to the nonrelativistic values of the literature.

The CI calculations were carried out using double precision arithmetic in the computer program (about 15 decimal digits accuracy in our computer). We have calculated the energy of 6 S-states, 6 P-states, 5 D-states and 4 F-states. Some of these states are reported here for first time. Due to the large number of excited states we have chosen the notation 1S for the ground state, 2S for the first excited and so on. The hydrogenic notation would be rather confusing in this context. The total energies of all 21 states of the Li atom determined in this study are below than the total energy of the ground state of the $^{\infty}$Li$^+$ ion, i.e. $E_{tr} \approx$ -7.279 913 412 669 305 964 914 69(5) a.u. [38]. This total energy of the ground state in the two-electron $^{\infty}$Li$^+$ ion is the natural threshold energy for an arbitrary bound state in the three-electron Li atom.

For the Be$^+$ ion we have determined the total energies of twenty two bound states, including seven S-states, six P-states, five D-states and four F-states. The results of our calculations can be found in Tables V and VI. In all these calculations we have applied CI method. The computed energies are lower than the corresponding ionization energy of Be^+ ion [18]. The accuracy of the calculations is also of about 1 millihartree. Note that the F-states calculated with the CI method are reported here for first time.

In the Hy-CI calculations we have employed the same blocks of configurations as in the CI calculations, see Table I, and added blocks of these configurations multiplied by one interelectronic coordinate at a time, i.e. $\mathrm{CI}\times(1+r_{12}+r_{13}+r_{23})$. For details on the selection of configurations, see the Calculations section. We have performed Hy-CI calculations up to the basis $n=6$.

It is important to mention, that in Hy-CI calculations, usually it is not necessary to use a basis as large as in the CI calculations. The reason is the main advantage of the Hy-CI method: the wave function expansion converges faster to the exact solution. This is due to the explicit inclusion of the interelectronic coordinate in the wave function. In contrast, in the CI method, the interelectronic coordinate is not explicitly considered, and its effect is replaced by the use of high angular momentum orbitals. Therefore in Hy-CI calculations high angular momentum orbitals ($l \geq 3$) are not needed to achieve an accuracy of microhartree, which is the purpose of this paper.

In this work we have not calculated F-symmetry states with the Hy-CI method. This is of course possible. In our computer program the electronic integrals are defined for every l quantum number, but the kinetic energy integrals are currently restricted to $l \geq 2$, see Ref. [32]. The theoretical and computational implementation is somewhat cumbersome, and will be reported elsewhere.

We have optimized the Hy-CI orbital exponents using a basis set $n=4$ of about 400 configurations of all types considered. Subsequently, the exponents were kept fixed for calculations with $n=5$ and $n=6$ basis sets. The orbital exponents for very high excited states were difficult to calculate with small basis sets (higher n needed, i.e. for a 5S states orbitals with $n=5,6$ are needed). Therefore the optimized CI exponents were used. The orbital exponents of the Hy-CI calculations are shown in Tables III and IV.

Very similar to the CI method, the orbital exponents were optimized for every state. In addition, the selection of the contributing configurations of the blocks were done separately for every state. Therefore, the length of the wave function and the configurations included differ from state to state. This is natural, since we need different configurations to describe different excited states.

The nonrelativistic energies of the first 5 S-symmetry states and the 1P and 1D excited states of Li atom and Be$^+$ ion are known to high accuracy, whereas the other states have been determined less accurately (shorter wave functions), see Tables VII and VIII.

In the Hy-CI calculations on the Li atom, see Table VII, we have obtained an accuracy of 1-11 microhartree (1×10^{-6}) for the ground state and first S-, P-, and D-excited states. For higher excited states the accuracy is about 50 microhartrees. For very high excited states it is about 1 millihartree, as far as values for these states were known. We have determined the 4^2D -7.293 405 644 a.u. and 5^2D -7.289 731 555 states for first time, and got the best energy to date (benchmarks) for the 3^2P states -7.311 776 235 a.u. and 2^2D -7.311 166 857 a.u.

For the Be$^+$ ion the accuracy is still better, probably due to the larger nuclear charge, see Table VIII. For the ground state and lower lying states of every symmetry we have obtained an accuracy of few microhartrees, using less than 1000 configurations, whereas the best calculations in the literature needed ten times more (up to 35 000) configurations. The benchmarks obtained for Be$^+$ ion are: the 3^2P state with -13.783 519 845 a.u., and the herein newly calculated states: 6^2S -13.699 131 127 a.u., 6^2P -13.699 131 127 a.u., 4^2D -13.709 474 219 a.u. and 5^2D -13.709 474 219 a.u. The dissociation threshold for the three-electron $^\infty$Be$^+$ ion is $\approx$ -13.655 566 238 423 586 702 079 5(10) a.u. [38]. This value coincides with the total energy of the ground state of the Be^{2+} ion with the infinitely heavy nucleus.

We have obtained this accuracy employing only 0.3 % of the configurations employed in the most highly accurate calculations reported. Finally, all calculated states are ordered by their energy and presented in Tables XIX and X. All these states lay below the energy of ionization. Possibly, among these states, G-symmetry states with high energy are missing. In future works we plan to consider these states as well.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

We have calculated the total energies of twenty one and twenty two bound states in the Li atom and Be $^+$ ion, respectively. The variational wave functions of the S-, P-, D- and F-bound states in these three-electron atomic systems were constracted with the use of the CI and Hy-CI methods. The procedure consisted in the appropriate selection of configurations and optimization of one set of orbital exponents for every state. The total energies of the low-lying states are microhartree accurate, while for excited states the accuracy is about $1 \times 10^{-4} - 10^{-5}$ a.u. We have obtained several benchmarks and reported for first time the energy of highly excited states. These wave functions are convenient for the calculation of properties. Concretely, these wave functions have been used for the calculation of the transition probabilities during nuclear β-decay, where wave functions of very good quality are necessary to describe the atomic effects during nuclear reactions [45–47]. We plan to use this systematic method of calculation to determine ground and excited states of the following atoms and isoelectronic ions in the periodic table, such as Be, B and C.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are deeply indebted to Frederick King and James Sims for providing us with numerical results of Hylleraas and Hylleraas-CI calculations, respectively, on the lithium atom. These have proven useful in checking our computer program. Very interesting discussions with James Sims and Stanley Hagstrom are greatly acknowledged.

---

[1] CODATA Recommended values of the fundamental physical constants: 2006, P.J. Mohr, B.N. Taylor, and D.B. Newell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 633-730 (2008).

[2] H. Nakashima and H. Nakatsuji, J. Chem. Phys. **127**, 224104 (2007).

[3] H. Nakashima and H. Nakatsuji, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 154107 (2008).
H. Nakashima, Y. Hijikata, and H. Nakatsuji, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 154108 (2008).

[4] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 052507 (2009).

[5] M. Stanke, J. Komasa, D. Kedziera, S. Bubin nad L. Adamowicz, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 052507 (2008).

[6] M. Puchalski, D. Kedziera, and K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. A **80** 032521 (2009).

[7] L.M. Wang, Z.-C. Yan, H.X. Qiao, and G.W.F. Drake, Phys. Rev. A **85** 052513 (2012).

[8] A. L"uchow and H. Kleindienst, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **51**, 211 (1994).

[9] F.W. King, Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **40**, 57 (1999)

[10] A.J. Takkar, T. Koga, T. Tanabe, and H. Teruya, Chem. Phys. Lett. **366**, 95 (2002).

[11] A.M. Frolov, Eur. Phys. J. D **61**, 571 (2011).

[12] F.W. King, D. Quicker and J. Langer, J. Chem. Phys. **134**, 124114 (2011).

[13] F.W. King, J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem) **400**, 7 (1997).

[14] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, J. Chem. Phys. **55**, 4699 (1971).

[15] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, Phys. Rev. A **4**, 908 (1971).

[16] W. Woznicki, in A. Jucys, editor, *Theory of Electronic Shells in Atoms and Molecules*, A. Jucys, Ed. Mintis, Vilnius, p. 103, 1971.

[17] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **90**, 1600, (2002).

[18] M.B. Ruiz, *Hylleraas-Configuration interaction on the helium atom*, arXiv: 1207.7284v1[physics.atom-ph] (2012).

[19] G. Büsse, H. Kleindienst, and A. Lüchow, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **66**, 241, (1998).

[20] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 032518 (2011).

[21] M.B. Ruiz, in *Advances in the Theory of Quantum Systems in Chemistry and Physics*, P.E. Hoggan et al. (eds.), Progress in Theoretical Chemistry and Physics 22, 105-119 (2011).

[22] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, J. Chem. Phys. **124**, 094101 (2006).

[23] A. W. Weiss, Phys. Rev **122**, 1826 (1961).

[24] C.F. Bunge, Phys. Rev. **168**, 92 (1968).

[25] C.F. Bunge, Theor. Chem. Acc. **126**, 139 (2010).

[26] C.X. Almora-Díaz and C.F. Bunge, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **110**, 2982 (2010).

[27] S. Larsson, Phys. Rev. **169**, 49 (1968).

[28] E.U. Condon and G.H. Shortley, *The theory of atomic spectra*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1967).

[29] R. Stevenson, *Multiplet structure of atoms and molecules*, (W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia & London, 1965).

[30] M. B. Ruiz, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **101**, 246 (2005).

[31] R. Barrois, A. Lüchow, and H. Kleindienst, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **62**, 77 (1997).

[32] M.B. Ruiz, *Evaluation of Hylleraas-CI atomic integrals by integration over the coordinates of one electron. IV. An improved algorithm for three-electron kinetic energy integrals*, arXiv: 1207.7294v1 [physics.atom-ph] (2012).

[33] M. B. Ruiz, J. Math. Chem. **49**, 2457 (20011).

[34] M. B. Ruiz, J. Math. Chem. **46**, 24 (2009).

[35] J. S. Sims and S. A. Hagstrom, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **37**, 1519 (2004).

[36] A. M. Frolov and V. H. Smith, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **63**, 269 (1996).

[37] M. Puchalski and K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. A **78** 052511 (2008).

[38] A.M. Frolov, arXiv: 1212.6768v4[physics.atom-ph] (2012).

[39] R. Barrois, H. Kleindienst and A. Lüchow, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **61**, 107 (1997).

[40] J. S. Sims and S. A. Hagstrom, Phys. Rev. A **11**, 418 (1975).

[41] Z.-W. Wang, X.-W. Zhu and K.T. Chung, Physica Scr. **47**, 65 (1993).

[42] W. Wóznicki, M. Bylicki, B. Jaskólska and J. Pipin, Chem. Phys. Lett. **95** 609 (1983).

[43] Z.-W. Wang, X.-W. Zhu and K.T. Chung, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **25**, 3915 (1992).

[44] Z.-W. Wang, X.-W. Zhu and K.T. Chung, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 6914 (1992).

[45] A.M. Frolov and M.B. Ruiz, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042511 (2010).

[46] M.B. Ruiz and A.M. Frolov, Adv. Quantum Chem. **67**, xxx (2013).

[47] M.B. Ruiz and A.M. Frolov, *Accurate wave functions for the atomic effect in the nuclear* β^-*-decay of the Li atom*, submitted (2013).

TABLE I: Symmetry Adapted Configurations employed in the calculations of the S-, P- D- and F-symmetry atomic states of Li atom and Be$^+$ ion using the CI and Hy-CI methods. The Hy-CI configurations are obtained from the CI ones by multiplying them by the factor $R = \{1 + r_{12} + r_{13} + r_{23}\}$.

Atomic Configurations	State	Symmetry adapted configurations
1s2 2s	^2S	sss, spp, pps, sdd, dds, sff, ffs
1s2 2p	^2P	ssp, sps, ppp, ddp, pdd, spd, pds, sdp
1s2 3d	^2D	ssd, sds, spp, pps, ppd, ddd, spf, pfs, sfp
1s2 4f	^2F	ssf, sfs, ppf, ddf, fff

TABLE II: List of the Symmetry Adapted Configurations with quantum numbers L=0,1,2,3 and M_Z=0 employed in the CI and Hy-CI calculations of the Li atom and Be$^+$ ion. The notation sss stands for $s(1)s(2)s(3)$.

L	Confs.	Construction
0	sss	sss
0	spp	$sp_0p_0 - sp_1p_{-1} - sp_{-1}p_1$
0	pps	$p_0p_0s - p_1p_{-1}s - p_{-1}p_1s$
0	sdd	$sd_0d_0 - sd_1d_{-1} - sd_{-1}d_1 + sd_2d_{-2} + sd_{-2}d_2$
0	dds	$d_0d_0s - d_1d_{-1}s - d_{-1}d_1s + d_2d_{-2}s + d_{-2}d_2s$
0	sff	$sf_0f_0 - sf_1f_{-1} - sf_{-1}f_1 + sf_2f_{-2} + sf_{-2}f_2 - sf_3f_{-3} - sf_{-3}f_3$
0	ffs	$f_0f_0s - f_1f_{-1}s - f_{-1}f_1s + f_2f_{-2}s + f_{-2}f_2s - f_3f_{-3}s - f_{-3}f_3s$
1	ssp	ssp_0
1	sps	sp_0s
1	ppp	$p_0p_0p_0 - p_1p_{-1}p_0 - p_{-1}p_1p_0$
1	ddp	$d_0d_0p_0 - d_1d_{-1}p_0 - d_{-1}d_1p_0 + d_2d_{-2}p_0 + d_{-2}d_2p_0$
1	pdd	$p_0d_0d_0 - p_0d_1d_{-1} - p_0d_{-1}d_1 + p_0d_2d_{-2} + p_0d_{-2}d_2$
1	spd	$sp_0d_0 - sp_1d_{-1} - sp_{-1}d_1$
1	pds	$p_0d_0s - p_1d_{-1}s - p_{-1}d_1s$
1	sdp	$sd_0p_0 - sd_1p_{-1} - sd_{-1}p_1$
2	ssd	ssd_0
2	sds	sd_0s
2	spp	$sp_0p_0 + sp_1p_{-1} + sp_{-1}p_1$
2	pps	$p_0p_0s + p_1p_{-1}s + p_{-1}p_1s$
2	ppd	$p_0p_0d_0 - p_1p_{-1}d_0 - p_{-1}p_1d_0$
2	ddd	$d_0d_0d_0 - d_1d_{-1}d_0 - d_{-1}d_1d_0 + d_2d_{-2}d_0 + d_{-2}d_2d_0$
2	spf	$sp_0f_0 - sp_1f_{-1} - sp_{-1}f_1$
2	pfs	$p_0f_0s - p_1f_{-1}s - p_{-1}f_1s$
2	sfp	$sf_0p_0 - sf_1p_{-1} - sf_{-1}p_1$
3	ssf	ssf_0
3	sfs	sf_0s
3	ppf	$p_0p_0f_0 - p_1p_{-1}f_0 - p_{-1}p_1f_0$
3	ddf	$d_0d_0f_0 - d_1d_{-1}f_0 - d_{-1}d_1f_0 + d_2d_{-2}f_0 + d_{-2}d_2f_0$
3	fff	$f_0f_0f_0 - f_1f_{-1}f_0 - f_{-1}f_1f_0 + f_2f_{-2}f_0 + f_{-2}f_2f_0 - f_{-3}f_3f_0 - f_{-3}f_3f_0$

TABLE III: Exponents used in the CI and Hy-CI calculations of the Li atom.

State	$\alpha_{\mathrm{CI}} = \beta_{\mathrm{CI}}$	γ_{CI}	$\alpha_{\mathrm{Hy-CI}} = \beta_{\mathrm{Hy-CI}}$	$\gamma_{\mathrm{Hy-CI}}$
1^2S	4.644060	1.107868	2.994250	0.839625
2^2S	4.698079	0.561144	3.550050	0.438800
3^2S	4.605560	0.359164	3.241342	0.304425
4^2S	4.639431	0.258794	3.906990	0.235023
5^2S	4.602371	0.191464	4.602371	0.191464
6^2S	4.696442	0.154444		
1^2P	4.451592	0.827973	3.809592	0.762425
2^2P	4.507292	0.504441	3.520217	0.370508
3^2P	4.486842	0.320982	3.523842	0.255675
4^2P	4.577346	0.230959	3.844842	0.204309
5^2P	4.513159	0.169635	3.426592	0.170633
6^2P	4.581002	0.144740		
1^2D	4.512037	0.459812	3.359717	0.347508
2^2D	4.483217	0.247508	3.496259	0.253341
3^2D	4.483288	0.200160	3.846369	0.337295
4^2D	4.539008	0.166704	4.218008	0.166704
5^2D	4.492642	0.143125	4.492642	0.143125
1^2F	4.630029	0.299372		
2^2F	4.645336	0.186989		
3^2F	4.669615	0.174730		
4^2F	4.763930	0.141984		

TABLE IV: Exponents used in the CI and Hy-CI calculations of the Be$^+$ ion.

State	$\alpha_{\rm CI}=\beta_{\rm CI}$	$\gamma_{\rm CI}$	$\alpha_{\rm Hy-CI}=\beta_{\rm Hy-CI}$	$\gamma_{\rm Hy-CI}$
1^2S	6.345407	1.950188	4.173235	1.406372
2^2S	6.307744	1.019290	4.838717	0.876476
3^2S	6.280890	0.665840	4.766466	0.585863
4^2S	6.327154	0.479516	5.331658	0.442445
5^2S	6.304912	0.364545	6.304912	0.364545
6^2S	6.341861	0.304815	6.341861	0.304814
7^2S	6.685487	0.167770		
1^2P	6.141069	1.760345	4.746625	1.321000
2^2P	6.148030	0.964810	4.837058	0.712777
3^2P	6.158844	0.631221	4.800125	0.516000
4^2P	6.168223	0.465315	5.713473	0.414065
5^2P	6.189834	0.344862	3.951567	0.339598
6^2P	6.222913	0.290957	4.502617	0.340623
1^2D	6.132817	0.867614	4.804284	0.670348
2^2D	6.159980	0.591028	4.750784	0.588652
3^2D	6.134907	0.434209	5.720102	0.381441
4^2D	6.484197	0.337802	6.164669	0.296639
5^2D	6.157877	0.286801	6.164653	0.266044
1^2F	6.440871	0.589239		
2^2F	6.446382	0.372527		
3^2F	6.352375	0.344411		
4^2F	6.419948	0.285310		

TABLE V: Convergence of Full-CI (L-S) calculations on the ground and excited states of the Li atom with respect to the basis set. Basis sets constructed with s-, p-, d- and f-Slater orbitals. N is the number of configurations. The basis $n = 4$ stays for $[4s3p2d1f]$ or $[1s2s3s4s2p3p4p3d4d4f]$. Energy in a.u. and energy differences in mh.

State	N	n=5	N	n=6	N	n=7	N	Ref. Energy	Ref.	diff.
1^2S	311	-7.476 304 44	596	-7.476 816 76	991	-7.477 191 60	34020	-7.478 060 323 910 146 894	[7]	0.87
2^2S	311	-7.352 351 26	596	-7.352 980 75	991	-7.353 248 72	9576	-7.354 098 421 444 364 045	[7]	0.85
3^2S	311	-7.316 684 51	596	-7.317 410 04	991	-7.317 678 91	34020	-7.318 530 845 998 906 901	[7]	0.85
4^2S	311	-7.301 741 72	596	-7.302 341 81	991	-7.302 681 63	34020	-7.303 551 579 226 734 650	[7]	0.87
5^2S			596	-7.294 675 81	991	-7.294 935 22	17072	-7.295 859 509 943	[4]	0.92
6^2S					991	-7.289 596 50				
1^2P	440	-7.407 946 09	849	-7.408 436 70	1430	-7.408 618 73	32200	-7.410 156 532 652 370	[7]	1.54
2^2P	440	-7.334 958 50	849	-7.335 436 16	1430	-7.335 658 20	3012	-7.337 151 70	[39]	1.50
3^2P	440	-7.309 724 51	849	-7.310 199 70	1430	-7.310 382 99	120	-7.311 736	[40]	1.34
4^2P	440	-7.298 193 09	849	-7.298 615 12	1430	-7.298 802 13	1021	-7.300 287 5	[41]	1.50
5^2P			849	-7.292 379 98	1430	-7.292 544 80		-7.294 020	[42]	5.27
6^2P					1430	-7.288 748 91				
1^2D	384	-7.333 500 02	646	-7.333 934 72	1056	-7.334 100 04	32760	-7.335 523 543 524 685	[7]	1.42
2^2D	384	-7.309 181 71	646	-7.309 598 04	1056	-7.309 761 50	841	-7.311 190 1	[43]	1.43
3^2D	384	-7.297 924 73	646	-7.298 339 69	1056	-7.298 501 90		-7.299 928	[9]	1.43
4^2D			646	-7.292 225 44	1056	-7.292 387 16				
5^2D					1056	-7.288 700 67				
1^2F	120	-7.309 517 06	286	-7.310 288 32	532	-7.310 609 58		-7.311 168 7	[9]	0.56
2^2F	120	-7.298 267 04	286	-7.298 989 11	532	-7.299 340 26		-7.299 917 1	[9]	0.58
3^2F			286	-7.292 768 68	532	-7.293 211 21				
4^2F					532	-7.289 401 46				

TABLE VI: Convergence of Full-CI (L-S) calculations on the ground and excited states of the Be$^+$ ion with respect to the basis set. The basis set used is the same as for the Li atom calculations of Table V. Energy in a.u. and energy differences in mh.

State	N	n=5	N	n=6	N	n=7	N	Ref. Energy	Ref.	diff.
1^2S	311	-14.322 774 16	596	-14.323 467 80	991	-14.323 768 55	13944	-14.324 763 176 790 43(22)	[6]	0.99
2^2S	311	-13.920 770 83	596	-13.921 528 75	991	-13.921 830 02	10000	-13.922 789 268 544 2	[37]	0.96
3^2S	311	-13.796 632 80	596	-13.797 443 52	991	-13.797 753 82	1888	-13.798 716 57	[9]	0.96
4^2S	311	-13.742 568 73	596	-13.743 267 09	991	-13.743 654 84	1091	-13.744 630 6	[44]	0.98
5^2S			596	-13.714 813 58	991	-13.715 222 17	2058	-13.716 286 24	[9]	1.1
6^2S			596	-13.689 752 76	991	-13.697 421 32				
7^2S					991	-13.680 062 35				
1^2P	440	-14.176 680 58	849	-14.177 210 03	1430	-14.177 408 92	10000	-14.179 333 293 342 7	[37]	1.92
2^2P	384	-13.882 595 98	849	-13.883 174 21	1430	-13.883 424 67		-13.885 15	[42]	1.73
3^2P	384	-13.781 120 58	849	-13.781 744 85	1430	-13.781 974 77		-13.783 518 3	[41]	1.54
4^2P	384	-13.734 716 26	849	-13.735 200 34	1430	-13.735 465 95	1021	-13.737 18	[42]	1.71
5^2P			849	-13.710 139 54	1430	-13.710 330 80		-13.712 06	[42]	1.73
6^2P					1430	-13.695 227 99				
1^2D	384	-13.875 781 49	646	-13.876 260 79	1056	-13.876 446 73	841	-13.878 052 6	[43]	1.60
2^2D	384	-13.778 423 93	646	-13.778 890 12	1056	-13.779 083 58	841	-13.780 696 0	[43]	1.61
3^2D	384	-13.733 383 90	646	-13.733 841 36	1056	-13.734 023 64	841	-13.735 637 0	[43]	1.61
4^2D			646	-13.709 376 51	1056	-13.709 537 57				
5^2D					1056	-13.694 803 96				
1^2F	120	-13.778 730 68	286	-13.779 403 25	532	-13.779 945 95				
2^2F	120	-13.733 732 72	286	-13.734 363 32	532	-13.734 923 61				
3^2F			286	-13.709 787 93	532	-13.710 457 22				
4^2F					532	-13.695 578 93				

TABLE VII: Calculated Hy-CI energies of the ground S-state and first S-, P-, and D-excited states of Li atom. Convergence of the calculations and comparison with energy values of the literature. N is the number of symmetry adapted configurations. Energy in a.u. Energy differences in μh. Benchmark calculations are written in bold.

n	State	N	n=4	N	n=5,6	N	Ref. Ener.	Ref.	Diff. in μh
1	1^2S	309	-7.478 053 222 500	693	-7.478 058 968 847	34020	-7.478 060 323 910 146 894	[7]	1.41
3	2^2S	307	-7.354 078 274 550	549	-7.354 093 706 422	34020	-7.354 098 421 444 364 045	[7]	4.71
6	3^2S	252	-7.318 481 008 275	591	-7.318 517 758 979	34020	-7.318 530 845 998 906 901	[7]	13.1
10	4^2S			687	-7.303 496 699 422	34020	-7.303 551 579 226 734 650	[7]	60.7
14	5^2S			491	-7.295 739 602 768	17072	-7.295 859 509 943	[4]	120.0
2	1^2P	381	-7.410 134 122 668	616	-7.410 149 069 693	32200	-7.410 156 532 652 370	[7]	7.5
4	2^2P	530	-7.337 055 166 688	766	-7.337 099 254 449	3012	-7.337 151 70	[39]	52.5
7	3^2P	466	**-7.311 724 861 462**	659	**-7.311 776 235 496**	120	-7.311 736	[40]	-40.0
12	4^2P			573	-7.300 091 953 421	1021	-7.300 287 5	[41]	195.5
16	5^2P			1297	-7.293 967 121 805		-7.294 020	[42]	53.0
5	1^2D	188	-7.335 505 134 976	238	-7.335 511 801 876	32760	-7.335 523 543 524 685	[7]	11.7
8	2^2D	176	-7.311 192 543 434	187	**-7.311 211 047 253**	841	-7.311 190 1	[43]	-21.0
13	3^2D	273	-7.298 186 482 327	372	-7.299 416 502 739		-7.299 928	[9]	51.2
17	4^2D			271	**-7.297 145 785 698**				
20	5^2D			525	**-7.289 731 554 753**				

TABLE VIII: Calculated Hy-CI energies of the ground S-state and first S-, P-, and D-excited states of the Be$^+$ ion. Convergence of the calculations and comparison with energy values of the literature. N is the number of symmetry adapted configurations. Energy in a.u. Energy differences in μh. Benchmark calculations are written in bold.

n	State	N	n=4	N	n=5,6	N	Ref. Ener.	Ref.	diff
1	1^2S	514	-14.324 757 377 542	1028	-14.324 761 678 324	13944	-14.324 763 176 790 150	[6]	1.5
3	2^2S	502	-13.922 759 980 099	1199	-13.922 784 968 156	10000	-13.922 789 268 554 2	[37]	4.3
6	3^2S	409	-13.798 520 453 185	757	-13.798 706 849 282	1888	-13.798 716 57	[9]	9.7
10	4^2S			1020	-13.744 518 213 729	1091	-13.744 630 6	[44]	112.4
14	5^2S			1066	-13.716 152 057 533	2058	-13.716 286 24	[9]	134.2
18	6^2S			771	**-13.699 131 126 904**				
2	1^2P	373	-14.179 314 874 884		-14.179 326 617 395	10000	-14.179 333 293 342 7	[37]	7.2
4	2^2P	499	-13.885 035 680 428	707	-13.885 072 810 365		-13.885 15	[42]	77.0
7	3^2P	352	-13.783 432 326 337	634	**-13.783 519 845 223**	1021	-13.783 518 3	[41]	-1.5
11	4^2P			480	-13.734 833 028 296		-13.737 18	[42]	2350.0
16	5^2P			1232	-13.711 935 267 558		-13.712 06	[42]	125.0
20	6^2P			459	**-13.711 378 664 909**				
5	1^2D	265	-13.878 005 890 429	338	-13.878 031 745 646	841	-13.878 052 6	[43]	21.0
9	2^2D	230	-13.779 724 787 607	298	-13.780 335 992 025	841	-13.780 696 0	[43]	360.0
13	3^2D	250	-13.728 658 182 159	216	-13.735 055 937 333	841	-13.735 637 0	[43]	581.1
17	4^2D			239	**-13.709 739 027 953**				
21	5^2D			192	**-13.677 409 085 288**				

TABLE IX: The total energies of some S-, P-, and D-states of the Li atom (in a.u.) ordered by their energy. The total energy of ionized Li$^+$ ions is -7.279 913 412 669 305 964 914 69(5) a.u. [38] (threshold energy).

n	State	E(FCI)	E(Hy-CI)	Ref. Energy	Ref.
1	1^2S	-7.477 191 60	-7.478 058 91	-7.478 060 323 910 146 894	[7]
2	1^2P	-7.408 618 73	-7.410 149 07	-7.410 156 532 652 370	[7]
3	2^2S	-7.353 248 72	-7.354 093 71	-7.354 098 421 444 364 045	[7]
4	2^2P	-7.335 658 20	-7.337 092 97	-7.337 151 70	[39]
5	1^2D	-7.334 100 04	-7.335 505 13	-7.335 523 543 524 685	[7]
6	3^2S	-7.317 678 91	-7.318 517 76	-7.318 530 845 998 906 901	[7]
7	3^2P	-7.310 382 99	-7.311 776 23	-7.311 728 51	[41]
8	2^2D	-7.309 761 50	-7.311 211 05	-7.311 190 1	[43]
9	1^2F	-7.309 517 06			
10	4^2S	-7.302 681 63	-7.303 490 87	-7.303 551 579 226 734 650	[7]
11	2^2F	-7.299 340 26			
12	4^2P	-7.298 802 13	-7.300 010 05	-7.300 287 5	[41]
13	3^2D	-7.298 501 90	-7.296 927 03	-7.299 928	[9]
14	5^2S	-7.294 935 22	-7.295 735 01	-7.295 859 509 943	[4]
15	3^2F	-7.293 211 21			
16	5^2P	-7.292 544 80	-7.293 967 12	-7.294 020	[42]
17	4^2D	-7.292 387 16	-7.292 225 21		
18	6^2S	-7.289 596 50			
19	4^2F	-7.289 401 46			
20	6^2P	-7.288 748 91			
21	5^2D	-7.288 700 67			

TABLE X: The total energies of some S-, P-, and D-states of the Be^+ ion ordered by their energy. The total energy of the ground state in the Be^{2+} ion is: -13.655 566 238 4235 867 020 795(10) a.u. [38] (threshold energy).

n	State	E(FCI)	E(Hy-CI)	Ref. Energy	Ref.
1	1^2S	-14.323 768 55	-14.324 761 68	-14.324 763 176 790 150	[6]
2	1^2P	-14.177 408 92	-14.179 326 07	-14.179 333 293 342 7	[37]
3	2^2S	-13.921 830 02	-13.922 784 97	-13.922 789 268 554 2	[37]
4	2^2P	-13.883 424 67	-13.885 072 81	-13.885 15	[42]
5	1^2D	-13.876 446 73	-13.878 005 89	-13.878 052 6	[44]
6	3^2S	-13.797 753 82	-13.798 706 85	-13.798 716 57	[9]
7	3^2P	-13.781 974 77	-13.783 519 84	-13.783 518 3	[41]
8	1^2F	-13.779 945 95			
9	2^2D	-13.779 083 58	-13.780 335 99	-13.780 696 0	[44]
10	4^2S	-13.743 654 84	-13.744 589 13	-13.744 630 6	[43]
11	4^2P	-13.735 465 95	-13.733 901 88	-13.737 18	[42]
12	2^2F	-13.734 923 61			
13	3^2D	-13.734 023 64	-13.728 692 76	-13.735 637 0	[44]
14	5^2S	-13.715 222 17	-13.716 152 06	-13.716 286 24	[9]
15	3^2F	-13.710 457 22			
16	5^2P	-13.710 139 54	-13.711 935 27	-13.712 06	[42]
17	4^2D	-13.709 537 57	-13.728 692 76		
18	6^2S	-13.697 421 32	-13.699 131 13		
19	4^2F	-13.695 578 93			
20	6^2P	-13.695 227 99	-13.711 378 66		
21	5^2D	-13.694 803 96	-12.631 500 84		
22	7^2S	-13.680 062 35			